



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

VB

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/040,485 03/17/98 RADOSEVICH J 8998/3

ALICE O. HARTIN
BARNES & THORNBURG
200 WEST MADISON STREET
SUITE 2610
CHICAGO IL 60610

HM12/0307

EXAMINER

BURKE, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1642

DATE MAILED:

03/07/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory Action

Application No.
09/040,485

Applicant(s)
Radosevich et al

Examiner
Julie E. Burke (Reeves), Ph.D.

Group Art Unit
1642



THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ expires three months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☐ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on _____ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on 10 Feb 2000 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

☒ The proposed amendment(s):

- ☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
- ☒ will not be entered because:
- ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
 - ☒ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
 - ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
 - ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: the proposed amdt deletes phrase "that are immunologically active" from claim 9, however, previous version of claim 9 recites "that is immunologically active". The proposed amdt has separated the individual peptides of SEQ Id NO 6, for example, into their individual residues (see Ala, Pro, Pro, etc)

☒ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

had the amdt been entered, it would have overcome the new mater rejection (para 11a), 112 2nd (para 12).

- ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
- ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
for reasons of record
- ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
- ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
- Claims allowed: none
- Claims objected to: none
- Claims rejected: 6-7, 9-11, 19-20 with claims 1-5, 8, 12-18 withdrawn as nonelected inventions
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.
- ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Other The language "consisting essentially" raises new issues as this is broader than the "having" language or the "consisting of" or comprising" language recommended in the previous Office Action.

J. Burke
JULIE BURKE
PATENT EXAMINER